

body. For those of you that were paying attention to what Senator Kristensen was saying, he and I are going to have a discussion over procedures, as I understand, tomorrow. And in anticipation of that, perhaps it might be appropriate if we read through our rule book as to how resolutions are treated, and certainly from the perspective that the constitution requires one day between Select File and Final Reading, and what precedent that we want to accept with whatever we do tomorrow on this. So, our argument primarily will be on what is the best procedure, not necessarily upon the merits or downside of the resolution. So, I just wanted to share that with you. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Mr. Clerk, you have an amendment.

CLERK: Madam President, Senator Chambers would move to amend. (Chambers amendment, FA583, appears on page 2091 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members, there is no way this legislative session can end without me offering an amendment to a bill, in this case a proposal to add to the constitution, and this is a serious amendment. In Senator Kristensen's amendment is language related to a summary. My amendment would strike all reference to the summary. The reason I would like to do that, first of all, I'm opposed to tampering with Final Reading. But we haven't reached that point yet. I want to tell you why I'm offering this amendment to Senator Kristensen's, because what he's offering is better than the green copy of the bill. The green copy would probably be easier for me to persuade you to defeat. But in case that doesn't happen, what he's offering is an improvement over that. Somebody would have to write a summary, it probably would be staff members. If there is a lot of controversy surrounding, let's say a very long bill and it is agreed that the bill itself won't be read, then who is going to write a summary that will satisfy the warring factions? And if the summary has to be a virtual paraphrasing of the bill to appear to be objective, then the bill may as well be read. It wouldn't have to be a long bill, because this allows us to say we won't read any bill, if a large enough majority chose not to have it read. So let's say it's one of those bills that ConAgra or some group wanted that